arXiv:1611.03570v1 [math.DS] 11 Nov 2016

FACTORING ONTO TOPOLOGICALLY STRONG SPATIAL MIXING $\mathbb{Z}^2$ SUBSHIFTS

KEVIN MCGOFF AND RONNIE PAVLOV

Abstract. We prove that every two-dimensional block gluing subshift factors onto every two-dimensional subshift of strictly lower topological entropy which satisfies the topologically strong spatial mixing condition defined in [3]. This result extends the two-dimensional case of a theorem from [2], which requires that the factor contain a safe symbol.

1. Introduction

A long-standing problem in the study of topological dynamical systems is the conjugacy problem, i.e., the problem of determining whether two dynamical systems which appear different actually exhibit the same dynamical behavior. A related problem is to determine when a topological dynamical system factors onto another one, i.e., when there is a surjective continuous map from the first to the second which intertwines their actions. Such maps are called factor maps, and they have been widely studied. We focus on these problems in the context of symbolic dynamical systems, also called shift spaces or subshifts.

For any natural number d and finite set A, called the alphabet, a $\mathbb{Z}^d$ subshift is any closed subset of $A^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ which is invariant under translation by any $v \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. The $\mathbb{Z}^d$ action $\sigma = (\sigma_v)_{v\in\mathbb{Z}^d}$ defined by these translations also provides the dynamics. We often refer to a subshift just by the set X with the understanding that the dynamics are always provided by σ. Examples of easily defined subshifts are the so-called $\mathbb{Z}^d$ shifts of finite type (or $\mathbb{Z}^d$ SFTs): for any finite set $\mathcal{F}$ of finite patterns, $X(\mathcal{F})$ is defined as the set of all elements of $A^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ which do not contain translates of any $w \in \mathcal{F}$. A special case is $X(\varnothing) = A^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$, called the full shift.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 37B50; Secondary: 37B10, 37A35.

Key words and phrases. $\mathbb{Z}^d$; shift of finite type; topologically strong spatial mixing.

The first author acknowledges the support of NSF grant DMS-1613261. The second author acknowledges the support of NSF grant DMS-1500685.

There are two well-known necessary conditions for the existence of a factor map from X onto Y. First, if $\sigma_v(x) = x$ for some $x \in X$ and $v \in \mathbb{Z}$, then $\sigma_v(\phi(x)) = \phi(x)$. Thus, X and Y must satisfy Condition (P): for every $x \in X$, there exists $y \in Y$ such that if $\sigma_v(x) = x$, then $\sigma_v(y) = y$. Note that this condition is always satisfied when Y contains a fixed point, i.e., a point y such that $\sigma_v(y) = y$ for all $v \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. Second, the topological entropy of a subshift X (denoted by $h(X)$; see Section 2 for the definition) cannot increase under a factor map, and so it must be the case that $h(X) \geq h(Y)$. Surprisingly, for restricted classes of subshifts, these necessary conditions also seem to be nearly sufficient. (The theorem from [1] is in fact stronger than what we state here but would require definitions not relevant to the rest of this work.)

Theorem 1.1 ([1])**.** *For mixing $\mathbb{Z}$ SFTs X and Y with $h(X) > h(Y)$, there exists a factor map from X onto Y if and only if X and Y satisfy Condition (P).*

When $d = 1$ and Y is a full shift, even the equal entropy case ($h(X) = h(Y)$) can be addressed. In this case, Y automatically contains fixed points, and so no additional periodic point hypothesis is necessary.

Theorem 1.2 ([1], [7])**.** *For a $\mathbb{Z}$ SFT X and a full shift Y with $h(X) \geq h(Y)$, there exists a factor map from X onto Y.*

Unfortunately, the situation is much more complicated for $d > 1$. In particular, there are several different candidates for the proper extension of "mixing" to the multidimensional case. We consider three such notions in this work, listed in increasing order of strength: block gluing, strong irreducibility, and topologically strong spatial mixing (definitions are given in Section 2). We do not attempt to summarize the entire literature on this topic, but here are a few representative results. First, the theorems for $\mathbb{Z}$ subshifts do not directly extend to $\mathbb{Z}^d$ subshifts when $d > 1$.

Theorem 1.3 ([2])**.** *For every $d > 1$, there exist $\mathbb{Z}^d$ SFTs with arbitrarily high entropy which do not factor onto any full shift.*

Theorem 1.4 ([8])**.** *For every $d \geq 3$ and every $\mathbb{Z}^d$ full shift Y, there exists a block gluing $\mathbb{Z}^d$ SFT with $h(X) = h(Y)$ such that there is no factor map from X onto Y.*

On the other hand, under strong enough mixing conditions, some factoring results are available for $d > 1$.

Theorem 1.5 ([2])**.** *If X is a block gluing $\mathbb{Z}^d$ subshift, Y is a full shift, and $h(X) > h(Y)$, then there exists a factor map from X onto Y.*

In fact, the previous theorem can be improved slightly. We say that a subshift Y has a safe symbol 0 if for any point $y \in Y$ and any subset $S \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$, changing the letters of y on S to 0s yields a point in Y. Note that the existence of safe symbol 0 in Y implies that the fixed point consisting of all 0s is in Y and that Y satisfies all three of the mixing conditions referenced above. In fact, the previous theorem remains true when Y is only assumed to have a safe symbol.

Theorem 1.6 ([2])**.** *If X is a block gluing $\mathbb{Z}^d$ subshift, Y is a $\mathbb{Z}^d$ subshift with a safe symbol, and $h(X) > h(Y)$, then there exists a factor map from X onto Y.*

However, this hypothesis on Y is quite restrictive, and in particular, it does not seem very "dynamical." For instance, no higher block recoding of any subshift (even a full shift) can have a safe symbol. The main result of the present work is the following theorem, which allows one to weaken the hypothesis on Y further using the notion of topologically strong spatial mixing (TSSM) from [3] for $d = 2$.

Theorem 1.7. *If X is a block gluing $\mathbb{Z}^2$ subshift, Y is a TSSM $\mathbb{Z}^2$ subshift with a fixed point, and $h(X) > h(Y)$, then there exists a factor map from X onto Y.*

The proof we present works only for $d = 2$, and we do not know whether the result holds for $d > 2$ or not. Although TSSM is not a conjugacy-invariant condition, it is more robust than the existence of a safe symbol. For instance, whenever Y has TSSM, any higher block recoding of Y also has TSSM. Whether there exists a naturally-defined conjugacy-invariant hypothesis on Y that guarantees the existence of such factor maps seems to be an interesting open question. (Here we say "naturally defined" to avoid manufactured conditions like "Y is conjugate to a full shift," which, though conjugacy-invariant, are likely unhelpful in practice.)

A simple condition that implies TSSM for a nearest-neighbor SFT is single-site fillability (SSF), which just means that for any choice of letters $a, b, c, d \in A$, there exists $e \in A$ for which the configuration $\begin{smallmatrix} & a & \\ b & e & c \\ & d & \end{smallmatrix}$ is legal. The following corollary is immediate.

Corollary 1.8. *If X is a block gluing $\mathbb{Z}^2$ subshift, Y is a $\mathbb{Z}^2$ nearest-neighbor SFT that satisfies single-site fillability and has a fixed point, and $h(X) > h(Y)$, then there exists a factor map from X onto Y.*

Corollary 1.8 can be used to create explicit examples of new subshifts to which our results apply, since there are many nearest-neighbor SFTs which have fixed points and satisfy SSF without having a safe symbol.

For instance, one can take any alphabet A with $|A| \geq 5$, take any non-identity involution f on A, and define Y by the rule that no pair of letters $\{a, f(a)\}$ can be adjacent.

As shown in [3], there also exist TSSM subshifts that do not satisfy SSF, such as the iceberg shift of Burton and Steif ([4]).

2. Definitions

We begin with some basic geometric definitions for $\mathbb{Z}^2$. Anytime we refer to distance in $\mathbb{Z}^2$, it is with respect to the ℓ_∞ distance given by $d((v_1, v_2), (w_1, w_2)) = \max(|v_1 - w_1|, |v_2 - w_2|)$. This yields a natural graph structure on $\mathbb{Z}^2$, where we say that two sites in $\mathbb{Z}^2$ are adjacent when they have distance exactly 1. For sets $A, B \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$, we define $d(A, B) = \min_{a \in A, b \in B} d(a, b)$. For every k, we use C_k to denote the square $[1, k]^2$. For any set $S \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$, we define its **boundary** ∂S to be the set of all $v \in S^c$ adjacent to some $v' \in S$.

Let A denote a finite set, which we will refer to as an alphabet.

Definition 2.1. A **pattern** over A is a member of A^S for some $S \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$, which is said to have **shape** S. We may refer to any pattern with finite shape as a **finite pattern**.

We only consider patterns to be defined up to translation: if $u \in A^S$ for a finite $S \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$ and $v \in A^T$, where $T = S + p$ for some $p \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, then we write $u = v$ to mean that $u(s) = v(s + p)$ for each s in S.

For any patterns $v \in A^S$ and $w \in A^T$ with $S \cap T = \varnothing$, we define the concatenation vw to be the pattern in $A^{S \cup T}$ defined by $(vw)(S) = v$ and $(vw)(T) = w$.

Definition 2.2. For any finite alphabet A, the **$\mathbb{Z}^2$-shift action** on $A^{\mathbb{Z}^2}$, denoted by $\{\sigma_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}^2}$, is defined by $(\sigma_t x)(s) = x(s + t)$ for $s, t \in \mathbb{Z}^2$.

We always think of $A^{\mathbb{Z}^2}$ as being endowed with the product discrete topology, with respect to which it is compact.

Definition 2.3. A $\mathbb{Z}^2$ **subshift** is a closed subset of $A^{\mathbb{Z}^2}$ that is invariant under the $\mathbb{Z}^2$-shift action.

Any $\mathbb{Z}^2$ subshift inherits a topology from $A^{\mathbb{Z}^2}$, with respect to which it is compact. Each σ_t is a homeomorphism on any $\mathbb{Z}^2$ subshift, and so any $\mathbb{Z}^2$ subshift, when paired with the $\mathbb{Z}^2$-shift action, is a topological dynamical system.

Any $\mathbb{Z}^2$ subshift can also be defined in terms of forbidden patterns: for any set $\mathcal{F}$ of finite patterns over A, one can define the set

$$X(\mathcal{F}) := \{x \in A^{\mathbb{Z}^2} \ : \ (x)(S) \notin \mathcal{F} \ \text{ for all finite } S \subset \mathbb{Z}^2\}.$$

It is well known that any set of the form $X(\mathcal{F})$ is a $\mathbb{Z}^2$ subshift, and all $\mathbb{Z}^2$ subshifts may be presented in this way.

Definition 2.4. A $\mathbb{Z}^2$ **shift of finite type (SFT)** is a $\mathbb{Z}^2$ subshift equal to $X(\mathcal{F})$ for some finite set $\mathcal{F}$ of finite forbidden patterns. If $\mathcal{F}$ consists only of patterns consisting of pairs of adjacent letters, then $X(\mathcal{F})$ is called **nearest-neighbor**.

Definition 2.5. The **language** of a $\mathbb{Z}^2$ subshift X, denoted by $L(X)$, is the set of all patterns that appear in elements of X. For any $S \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$, let $L_S(X) := L(X) \cap A^S$, the set of patterns in the language of X with shape S.

Remark 2.6. We have defined the language of a subshift to include both the finite and infinite patterns that appear in elements of X. We adopt this convention for convenience of presentation, despite the fact that many authors do not include infinite patterns in the language.

Definition 2.7. Suppose X and Y are compact, metrizable spaces. Further suppose that $\mathbb{Z}^2$ acts on each of these spaces by homeomorphisms, with actions denoted by σ and τ, respectively. A (topological) **factor map** is any continuous surjection $\phi : X \to Y$ such that $\phi \circ \sigma_p = \tau_p \circ \phi$ for each $p \in \mathbb{Z}^2$. In this case, the pair (Y, τ) is called a **factor** of (X, σ), and we say that X factors onto Y. A bijective factor map is called a **topological conjugacy**.

For the purposes of this work, we restrict attention to factor maps between subshifts. It is well-known that any factor map ϕ between subshifts is a so-called sliding block code, i.e., there exists n so that $x(v+[-n,n]^2)$ uniquely determines $(\phi(x))(v)$ for any $x \in X$ and $v \in \mathbb{Z}^2$. (See [6] for a proof for $d = 1$, which extends to $d > 1$ without changes.)

Definition 2.8. Let X be a subshift with alphabet $\mathcal{A}$, and let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $F_n = \{0, \ldots, n-1\}^d$. The nth **higher block code** on X is the map $\beta_n : X \to \left(\mathcal{A}^{F_n}\right)^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ defined by $(\beta_n(x))_p = x(p + F_n)$ for all $p \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. The image $\beta_n(X)$ is called the nth higher block (re)coding of X.

Remark 2.9. The nth higher block code on any subshift is known to be a topological conjugacy onto its image. Also, if X is an SFT, then there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq N$, the nth higher block coding of X is nearest-neighbor.

Definition 2.10. The **topological entropy** of a $\mathbb{Z}^2$ subshift X is

$$h(X) := \lim_{m,n\to\infty} \frac{1}{mn} \log |L_{[1,m]\times[1,n]}(X)|.$$

The existence of this limit follows from a standard subadditivity argument, which also implies that the limit is an infimum, i.e., $h(X) \leq \frac{1}{mn} \log |L_{[1,m]\times[1,n]}(X)|$ for every m, n.

Finally, let us define some mixing properties for $\mathbb{Z}^2$ subshifts, all of which involve the appearance of multiple patterns from the language within a single element of X, provided that the patterns are separated by a large enough distance.

Definition 2.11. A $\mathbb{Z}^2$ subshift X is **block gluing** if there exists $g \geq 0$ so that for any rectangles $R, R' \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$ with $d(R, R') > g$ and any $w \in L_R(X)$ and $w' \in L_{R'}(X)$, there exists $x \in X$ with $x(R) = w$ and $x(R') = w'$.

Definition 2.12. A $\mathbb{Z}^2$ subshift X is **strongly irreducible** if there exists $g \geq 0$ such that for any finite sets $S, S' \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$ with $d(S, S') > g$ and any $w \in L_S(X)$ and $w' \in L_{S'}(X)$, there exists $x \in X$ with $x(S) = w$ and $x(S') = w'$.

Definition 2.13. A $\mathbb{Z}^2$ subshift X is **topologically strong spatial mixing** (or TSSM) if there exists $g \geq 0$ such that for any (disjoint) finite sets $U, V, W \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$ with $d(U, W) > g$ and any $u \in L_U(X)$, $v \in L_V(X)$, $w \in L_W(X)$ for which $uv, vw \in L(X)$, there exists $x \in X$ with $x(U) = u$, $x(V) = v$, and $x(W) = w$.

Strong irreducibility implies block gluing, since block gluing only refers to rectangular shapes. Similarly, TSSM implies strong irreducibility, since one may take $V = \varnothing$ in the definition of TSSM. Additionally, TSSM implies that a subshift is an SFT, and its definition can in some way be seen as a marriage of the uniform mixing property of strong irreducibility with the local definition of an SFT. For more on these properties (including examples of shifts which are block gluing but not strongly irreducible and then strongly irreducible but not TSSM), see [2] and [3].

3. Proof of Theorem 1.7

The overall structure of our proof is quite similar to the proofs that corner gluing subshifts factor onto full shifts with lower entropy (from [5]) and that block gluing subshifts factor onto full shifts with lower entropy (from [2]). By this we mean that the proof involves using markers to define "surrounded patterns" in the domain, which will be used to assign patterns on slightly larger "determined zones" after application of the map. The fundamental difference in our proof is that even when surrounded patterns in the domain are as close as the

markers allow, the associated determined zones will not be adjacent; instead, we leave a gap between them and then use TSSM to fill in between those gaps. Our method for filling these gaps was inspired by the proof from [3] that TSSM subshifts always contain (dense) periodic points. Very roughly speaking, given $x \in X$, its image $\phi(x)$ will look like the fixed point of Y at all sites not near a marker in x. Then we will partition the area between determined zones and the "background" given by the fixed point into zones, and we will fill these zones using only information from nearby sites in x. The hypothesis that Y has TSSM will imply that the resulting configuration is actually in Y.

To begin the formal proof, choose any X and Y as in the theorem, with alphabets $\mathcal{A}_X$ and $\mathcal{A}_Y$, respectively. We assume without loss of generality that $g \geq 0$ is a gap distance both for the block gluing of X and the TSSM of Y, that Y is a nearest-neighbor SFT (which may be obtained by taking a higher block recoding of Y), and that $\mathcal{A}_Y$ contains a letter 0 so that the fixed point $0^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ is in Y.

Let us now construct markers in X. The construction of such markers is outlined in [2], but we repeat some details here to set notation. Define a pattern $P \in L_{C_p}(X)$ (we take $p > g$) so that $h(X_P) > h(Y)$, where X_P is the subshift obtained by removing P from $L(X)$. Then define a pattern $Q \in L_{C_q}(X_P)$ for which Q cannot overlap itself at any nonzero vector in $[-g-p, g+p]^2$, i.e., for every such vector v, there does not exist $x \in A^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ for which $x(C_q) = x(C_q + v) = Q$. Then use block gluing to create a marker pattern $M \in L_{C_m}(X)$ ($m = 2p + 2g + q$) with P at each corner, Q in the center, and patterns $G_i \in L(X_P)$, $1 \leq i \leq 4$, along each edge, as in the left half of Figure 1. In any pattern as in the right half of Figure 1, where $S \in L_{C_k}(X_P)$ and each $H_i \in L(X_P)$, $1 \leq i \leq 4$, we call the central S a **surrounded pattern** and the entire pattern (including the H_i and the markers M) its **surrounding frame**. Since $h(X_P) > h(Y)$, for sufficiently large k it is the case that

$$|L_{C_k}(X_P)| > |L_{C_{k+g+m}}(Y)| \cdot |\mathcal{A}_Y|^{6g(k-g+m)+20g^2}.$$

Fix any such k, and then define a surjection ψ from $L_{C_k}(X_P)$ to the set of all tuples of the form $(i_j)_{1 \leq j \leq 11}$, where $1 \leq i_1 \leq L_{C_{k+g+m}}(Y)$, $1 \leq i_j \leq |\mathcal{A}_Y|^{g(k-g+m)}$ for $2 \leq j \leq 7$, and $1 \leq i_j \leq |\mathcal{A}_Y|^{5g^2}$ for $8 \leq j \leq 11$.

Now let x be in X. We will define the factor map ϕ by defining $\phi(x)$ in four stages. Notationally, we say that x defines (in a shift-commuting and continuous way) a partition $\mathbb{Z}^2 = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^{4} U_i$ and that Stage i defines $\phi(x)$ to be equal to a pattern w_i on U_i (both are dependent on x).



FIGURE 1. A marker pattern (left) and surrounded pattern (right)

Stage 1: First, we think of ϕ identifying all surrounded patterns in x. That is, let T be the set of $t \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ such that $x(t+C_k)$ is a surrounded pattern in x. For all $v \in T$, we will refer to the region $v + C_{k+g+m}$ as a **determined zone**, and in this stage we will define $\phi(x)$ on the set $U_1 = \bigsqcup_{t \in T} t + C_{k+g+m}$.

For a surrounded pattern $x(v + C_k)$, let $\psi(x(v + C_k)) = (i_j)_{1 \leq j \leq 11}$, and let $w_1(v+C_{k+g+m})$ be the i_1th pattern in $L_{C_{k+g+m}}(V)$ in the lexicographic ordering. As these regions are determined by the surrounded patterns, we use the term **determined zone** to refer to each such set $v + C_{k+g+m}$ in which patterns are thusly placed. Just as in [2] and [5], by the marker properties defining M, any two determined zones have distance more than g from each other, and so this step is well-defined.

In fact, for any two determined zones $v_1 + C_{k+g+m}$ and $v_2 + C_{k+g+m}$ with distance exactly $g + 1$, the patterns $x(v_1 + C_{k+2g+2m})$ and $x(v_2 + C_{k+2g+2m})$ have overlap consisting of either exactly one occurrence of M or a rectangle with dimensions m and $k + g + m$ with occurrences of M at the extreme ends. (See Figure 2.) In either case, we say that those determined zones are **adjacent**, and when referring to connected components of determined zones, we refer to this notion of adjacency. Finally, we claim that if two determined zones Z_1 and Z_2 are not adjacent, then

$$d(Z_1, Z_2) > 2g + p > 3g. \tag{1}$$

To see this, suppose for a contradiction that two determined zones are separated by a distance of more than g and less than $2g + p$. This means that x contains two surrounding frames separated by a vector $t = (t_1, t_2)$, which without loss of generality we can take to be $x(C_{k+3g+m})$ and $x(t + C_{k+3g+m})$. Also without loss of generality, we assume that $k + 2g + m < t_1 < k + 3g + m + p$ and $0 \leq t_2 < k + 3g + m + p$.

We note that if $t_2 \in [0, g+p)$, then $d(t, (k+2g+m, 0)) < g+p$, meaning that the lower-right copy of M within $x(C_{k+3g+m})$ and the lower-left copy of M within $x(t + C_{k+3g+m})$ would have separation by a nonzero vector in $[-g-p, g+p]^2$. This contradicts the definition of Q and so is impossible. Similarly $t_2 \in (k+2g+m, k+3g+m+p)$ is impossible, by a similar argument using the upper-right copy of M within $x(C_{k+3g+m})$ and the lower-left copy of M within $x(t+C_{k+3g+m})$. Therefore, $t_2 \in [g+p, k+2g+m]$. However, this too is a contradiction: for any such t_2, one of the copies of P along the left edge of the lower-left copy of M within $x(t+C_{k+3g+m})$ would lie within a pattern H along the right edge of $x(C_{k+3g+m})$, which was assumed to be in $L(X_P)$. We have thus established (1), a fact which will be useful later.



FIGURE 2. Surrounded patterns and the connected component of determined zones (in dotted lines) that they induce

To summarize Stage 1, U_1 is the union of all determined zones, which we may indeed write as $U_1 = \bigsqcup_{t \in T} t + C_{k+g+m}$, and w_1 the pattern we've defined there. Clearly $w_1 \in L(Y)$, since each pattern assigned to a determined zone was in $L(Y)$, Y has TSSM (strong irreducibility) at distance g, and all determined zones are separated by distances of more than g. We will think of U_1 as a disjoint union of connected components, where by (1), distinct connected components of determined zones have distance more than $3g$ from each other.

Stage 2: Define U_2 to be the set of all $v \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ at a distance of more than g from all determined zones, and define $w_2 = 0^{U_2}$. Clearly $w_2 \in L(Y)$ since $0^{\mathbb{Z}^2} \in Y$, and since $d(U_1, U_2) > g$, $w_1 w_2 \in L(Y)$ as well by TSSM (strong irreducibility) of Y at distance g. The pattern $w_1 w_2$ consists of a disjoint union of connected components of determined

zones, each of which is surrounded by a contour of 0s at distance $g+1$.

Stage 3: Recall that T consists of the locations of surrounded patterns in x, and define $U_3 = \bigsqcup_{t\in T}(t + (Z_L \cup Z_R \cup Z_U \cup Z_D))$, where $Z_L = [-g+1, 0] \times [g+1, k+m]$, $Z_R = [k+g+m+1, k+2g+m] \times [g+1, k+m]$, $Z_D = [g+1, k+m] \times [-g+1, 0]$, and $Z_U = [g+1, k+m] \times [k+g+m+1, k+2g+m]$. Informally, U_3 is the union of all rectangles with dimensions g and $k-g+m$ that share their longest side with a determined zone and are centered along the corresponding side of the determined zone. We will call these rectangles **bridges** and separate them into two types. A **type** 1 **bridge** is one which is adjacent to (lies between) two determined zones, and a **type** 2 **bridge** is one which is adjacent to (lies between) a determined zone and the contour of 0s surrounding its connected component. (See Figure 3.)



FIGURE 3. The two types of bridges (labeled 1 and 2) assigned during Stage 3 and the islands (shaded) assigned during Stage 4

For future reference, we check that any two bridges are separated by distance of more than g. Indeed, if the bridges are adjacent to determined zones in the same connected component, then this is fairly clear from construction, as illustrated in Figure 3. Furthermore, if they are adjacent to determined zones in different connected components, then since their associated connected components are separated by distance more than $3g$ (by (1)), and since each bridge consists of sites within distance g of its adjacent connected component, again the bridges are separated by distance more than g.

We now describe how x is used to assign a pattern w_3 (in a shift-commuting and continuous way) on U_3. Choose any bridge B, by which we mean a set $t + Z_i$ for $t \in T$ and $i \in \{L, R, U, D\}$. We begin with

the case where B is of type 1 and horizontal (i.e. wider than it is tall). Let A_1 and A_2 be the two determined zones adjacent to B, and let $a_1 = w_1(A_1)$ and $a_2 = w_1(A_2)$ be the patterns assigned during Stage 1 to those determined zones. Without loss of generality, we assume that A_1 is the leftmost of the pair $\{A_1, A_2\}$ and that $A_1 = u + C_{k+g+m}$. There is a collection of patterns which can legally lie on B given a_1 and a_2, i.e. $\{w \in (\mathcal{A}_Y)^B \ : \ a_1 w a_2 \in L(Y)\}$. By TSSM (strong irreducibility) of Y, this collection is nonempty, and it trivially has cardinality at most $|\mathcal{A}_Y|^{g(k-g+m)}$. We can then define $w_3(B)$ to be the i_2th pattern in this collection in the lexicographic ordering, where $\psi(x(u + C_k)) = (i_j)_{1 \leq j \leq 11}$. (We adopt the convention, here and later, that for a totally ordered set S and $n > |S|$, the nth element of S is just taken to be the maximal element.) If B were of type 1 and vertical, then we would define $w_3(B)$ in almost exactly the same way, but using i_3 rather than i_2.

Now, let's treat the case where B is of type 2, horizontal, and lies above a determined zone. Define A_1 to be the determined zone adjacent to B, (the other side of B is adjacent to the contour of 0s surrounding the connected component containing A_1), $a_1 = w_1(A_1)$ to be the pattern assigned during stage 1 to A_1, and let's say that $A_1 = u + C_{k+g+m}$. Define $z = 0^{\partial(A_i + [-g,g]^2)}$, a contour of 0s at distance $g+1$ from A_1. There is a collection of patterns which can legally lie on B given a_1 and z, i.e. $C = \{w \in A^B \ : \ a_1 w z \in L(Y)\}$. By TSSM (strong irreducibility) of Y, this collection is nonempty, and it trivially has cardinality at most $|\mathcal{A}_Y|^{g(k-g+m)}$. Letting $\psi(x(u + C_k)) = (i_j)_{1 \leq j \leq 11}$, we then define $w_3(B)$ to be the i_4th pattern in C in the lexicographic ordering. Corresponding definitions for other orientations of B are similar, except that i_5, i_6, or i_7 replaces i_4 when B lies below, to the left of, or to the right of a determined zone respectively.

At this point, we have defined w_3 on every bridge B and so on the entire set U_3. Let us now verify that $w_1 w_2 w_3 \in L(Y)$. Recall that we have already shown that $w_1 w_2 \in L(Y)$. We will prove that for each bridge B, the concatenation $w_1 w_2 w_3(B) \in L(Y)$, and then since each pair of distinct bridges is separated by distance more than g, the conclusion that $w_1 w_2 w_3 \in L(Y)$ will follow by TSSM of Y. We first consider the case where B is a bridge of type 1. Then B is adjacent to two determined zones A_1 and A_2 (with associated patterns $a_1 = w_1(A_1)$ and $a_2 = w_1(A_2)$), and by construction $a_1 w_3(B) a_2 \in L(Y)$. All other determined zones are distance more than g from $A_1 \cup B \cup A_2$, and so by TSSM (strong irreducibility) of Y, the concatenation $w_1 w_3(B) \in L(Y)$.

Similarly, U_2 has distance more than g from $U_1 \cup B$, and so by TSSM (strong irreducibility) of Y, the pattern $w_1w_2w_3(B) \in L(Y)$.

If instead B is a bridge of type 2, then it is adjacent to a determined zone A_1 (with associated pattern $a_1 = w_1(A_1)$) and a contour of 0s which surrounds the connected component of A_1. By construction, $a_1w_3(B)z \in L(Y)$, where z is a contour of 0s surrounding A_1 at distance $g+1$. Note that z may not be in w_2 (the pattern of 0s assigned in Stage 2); nevertheless we will show that $w_3(B)$ is legal when concatenated with w_1 and w_2. Since $0^{\mathbb{Z}^2} \in Y$ and Y is a nearest-neighbor SFT, this clearly implies that $a_1w_3(B)z' \in L(Y)$, where $z' = 0^{(A_1+[-g,g]^2)^c}$ is a "sea" of 0s at all sites farther than distance g from A_1. But then by definition of U_2, clearly $w_2 = 0^{U_2}$ is a subpattern of z', and so the pattern $a_1w_2w_3(B) \in L(Y)$. Since all other determined zones are distance greater than g from $A_1 \cup U_2 \cup B$, by TSSM (strong irreducibility) of Y, the concatenation $w_1w_2w_3(B) \in L(Y)$, as well. Since $w_1w_2w_3(B) \in L(Y)$ for all bridges, as argued above, $w_1w_2w_3 \in L(Y)$.

Stage 4: We first define $U_4 = (U_1 \cup U_2 \cup U_3)^c$. By construction, U_4 is a disjoint union of connected sets (in $\mathbb{Z}^2$) of size at most $5g^2$, which we call **islands**. (See Figure 3.) Each island is adjacent (for the purposes of Stage 4, the term "adjacent" refers to the usual notion of adjacency in $\mathbb{Z}^2$, and not to the previously defined notion of adjacency for determined zones) to at least one (and at most four) determined zones. We need to associate each island to a determined zone adjacent to it in some deterministic shift-commuting way; let's say that an island is associated to the determined zone adjacent to it whose orientation is first in the list "upper-left, upper-right, lower-left, lower-right." Now, choose any island I whose associated determined zone $A = u + C_{k+g+m}$ is to its upper-left. The collection of patterns $\{w \in (\mathcal{A}_Y)^I \ : \ w\big((w_1w_2w_3)(\partial I)\big) \in L(Y)\}$ is nonempty since $w_1w_2w_3 \in L(Y)$, and it has cardinality at most $|\mathcal{A}_Y|^{5g^2}$ since $|I| \leq 5g^2$.

We can then define $(\phi(x))(I)$ to be the i_8th pattern in this collection in the lexicographic ordering, where $\psi(x(u + C_k)) = (i_j)_{1 \leq j \leq 11}$. Corresponding definitions for other orientations of A are similar, except that i_9, i_{10}, or i_{11} replaces i_8 when A lies to the upper-right, lower-left, or lower-right of I respectively.

Since all islands I are disjoint, $(w_1w_2w_3)(\partial I)w_4(I) \in L(Y)$ for all I, and Y is a nearest-neighbor SFT, clearly $w_1w_2w_3w_4 \in Y$.

We finally define $\phi(x) = w_1w_2w_3w_4$. It remains to show that ϕ is shift-commuting, continuous, and surjective. For shift-commuting and

continuity, we claim that ϕ is a sliding block code. Specifically, we claim that $x(v+[-(k+4g+m),(k+4g+m)]^2)$ uniquely determines $(\phi(x))(v)$ for every $x \in X$, $v \in \mathbb{Z}^2$. Without giving every detail, we check this fact for each of the four possible stages during which $(\phi(x))(v)$ could have been assigned.

• If $(\phi(x))(v)$ was assigned during Stage 1 (i.e. $v \in U_1$), then v is part of a determined zone, and $(\phi(x))(v)$ is uniquely determined by the surrounded pattern within x inducing that determined zone. Checking that the pattern in question is surrounded involves only letters of x at sites within distance $k+g+m$ from v.
• If $(\phi(x))(v)$ was assigned during Stage 2 (i.e. $v \in U_2$), then v has distance more than g from all determined zones. Since knowledge of $x(v+[-k-g-m,k+g+m]^2)$ determines whether v is in a determined zone, knowledge of $x(v+[-k-2g-m,k+2g+m]^2)$ determines whether v is distance more than g from all determined zones.
• If $(\phi(x))(v)$ was assigned during Stage 3 (i.e. $v \in U_3$), then v is part of a bridge B. To determine the type of B (i.e. whether it has determined zones or the "sea of 0s" flanking its two longest sides), it suffices to know whether there were surrounding frames in the corresponding locations in x, all sites of which are within distance $k+3g+m$ from v. Then, knowledge of $(\phi(x))(v)$ is determined by $(\phi(x))(B)$, which depends only on the type of B and the corresponding surrounded patterns in x, which again are within distance $k+3g+m$ from v.
• If $(\phi(x))(v)$ was assigned during Stage 4 (i.e. $v \in U_4$), then v is part of an island I. Arguing similarly as for Stage 3, knowledge of $v(I)$ is determined by whether surrounding frames are in locations in x corresponding to the four possible locations for determined zones adjacent to I, and the letters of x in any corresponding surrounded patterns. All such sites are within distance $k+4g+m$ from v.

The proof that ϕ is surjective is quite similar to the ones from [2] and [5], but since there are some differences we describe it here anyway. Consider any $y \in Y$. Define $V = (k+2g+m)\mathbb{Z}^2$, and for $v \in V$, call each set $v + C_{k+g+m}$ a **prospective determined zone**. Similarly, for $v \in V$, we call each set $v+Z_i$, $i \in \{L,R,U,D\}$, a **prospective bridge**. We define $I = [-2g+1,g] \times [-g+1,0] \cup [-g+1,0] \times [-2g+1,g]$, and for $v \in V$, we call each set $v+I$ a **prospective island**.

For any $x \in X$ with surrounding frames overlapping as in Figure 4, $\phi(x)$ will have determined zones, bridges, and islands in each prospective determined zone, bridge, and island. Finally, we note that since ψ is a surjection, there exist choices of the surrounded patterns which

will yield the patterns within y occupying the determined zones, followed by the patterns within y occupying the bridges, followed by the patterns within y occupying the islands. Moreover, since X is block gluing at distance g, there exists $x \in X$ with exactly those surrounded patterns, meaning that $\phi(x) = y$. We have finished the proof that $\phi : X \to Y$ is a surjective factor map.



FIGURE 4. A collection of elements of X demonstrating the surjection of ϕ

REFERENCES

[1] Mike Boyle. Lower entropy factors of sofic systems. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 3(4):541–557, 1983.

[2] Mike Boyle, Ronnie Pavlov, and Michael Schraudner. Multidimensional sofic shifts without separation and their factors. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 362(9):4617–4653, 2010.

[3] Raimundo Briceño. The topological strong spatial mixing property and new conditions for pressure approximation. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*. To appear.

[4] Robert Burton and Jeffrey E. Steif. Non-uniqueness of measures of maximal entropy for subshifts of finite type. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 14(2):213–235, 1994.

[5] Angela Desai. A class of $\mathbb{Z}^d$ shifts of finite type which factors onto lower entropy full shifts. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 137(8):2613–2621, 2009.

[6] Douglas Lind and Brian Marcus. *An introduction to symbolic dynamics and coding*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.

[7] Brian Marcus. Factors and extensions of full shifts. *Monatsh. Math.*, 88(3):239–247, 1979.

[8] Ronnie Pavlov and Michael Schraudner. Entropies realizable by block gluing $\mathbb{Z}^d$ shifts of finite type. *J. Anal. Math.*, 126:113–174, 2015.

Kevin McGoff, Department of Mathematics, University of North Carolina at Charlotte, Charlotte, NC 28223
E-mail address: kmcgoff1@uncc.edu
URL: https://clas-math.uncc.edu/kevin-mcgoff/

Ronnie Pavlov, Department of Mathematics, University of Denver, 2280 S. Vine St., Denver, CO 80208
E-mail address: rpavlov@du.edu
URL: www.math.du.edu/∼rpavlov/